HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIV, No. 5 Saturday, February 2, 1957 Washington, D. C.

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

Labor Rackets Investigation: The creation of the new joint Senate committee to look into the problem of racketeering in labor unions is hailed on Capitol Hill as a brilliant success. A majority of the members of the committee are conservatives, including such vigorous investigators as Senators Barry Goldwater and Joseph R. McCarthy. Veteran observers around the Capital predict that the group will make history, and that its work may rank with some of the epochal investigations of our time.

However, those who engineered the appointment of the group emphasize that the new body will go into racketeering evidence in *all* labor unions; not merely the Teamsters (which, albeit quite deservedly, has recently got the spotlight), not merely in the A. F. of L., but in all labor unions and federations.

The probers want law enforcement bodies, officials, trade associations, and public-spirited labor union members to forward all possible evidence about offenses committed by unions, no matter what their affiliations might be.

The creators of the committee are keenly conscious that Walter Reuther would like to propagate the impression that the C. I. O. and "liberal" unions alone are free from such malpractices. Those who set up this investigating committee have no intention of allowing Reuther to profit by it.

As a matter of fact, experts on the labor problem for some time have held the opinion that racketeering is just as prevalent in the so-called "liberal" unions (such as those in the garment trades), as in the A. F. of L. craft unions. (When Victor Riesel, the labor columnist, was blinded by an acid-throwing assailant, it was remarked that this method of terrorism — throwing acid — was much more characteristic of garment union gangsters than of the brass knuckles-wielding Teamsters goons whom Riesel had been attacking.)

In New York, criminal investigators say that there are very few business agents in the garment unions of the whole city who aren't enjoying kickbacks from employers. This situation may lead to intensive rummaging among the affairs of uniform manufacturers and the unions they deal with, in view of the interest of the Senate committee in how Government money is being spent.

Both the International Ladies Garment Workers Union (ILGWU) of the A. F. of L. and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union of the C. I. O. are said to be derelict in tolerating such illegal practices.

Senators who keep their hand on the pulse of opinion of all classes of people believe that the man in the street makes no distinction between the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. and wants all organized labor thoroughly and honestly investigated and reformed.

The Budget: "They say, 'You cannot cut taxes, you cannot end or minimize Korean losses. You cannot stop inflation. . . .' What kind of stuff is that — don't and can't? Of course, we can and will." These words were spoken by Candidate Eisenhower on October 22, 1952, in his first election campaign. They have been disinterred in the past week and made a challenge to conservatives on Capitol Hill, who contrast Ike's former invigorating attitude with his present surrender to New Dealism and illimitable spending.

The fact is — so say those who mingle with Senate leaders of both parties — that a strong behind-the-scenes bipartisan effort is under way to plan ways and means of cutting the Eisenhower Budget. Senator Harry Byrd's claim that it could be cut from $5 to $8 billion is the subject of much comment. Byrd and GOP leader Styles Bridges are said to be working together very closely just now. While the Byrd figure is regarded as rather hopeful, there are some in the know who say, "Don't be surprised if they cut it by $3.5 billion." There looms the possibility that many Senators may support a motion to send the Budget back to the Budget Bureau with a request for drastic cutting. This bipartisan development is aided by the flood of mail from constituents demanding economy.

Federal Aid Again: The President's $2 billion request for a "comprehensive program of Federal assistance" for school construction in the states has stirred strong opposition in the Capital. The President asked $1.3 billion in grants and three-quarters of a billion in loans, to be disbursed over the next

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

four years in a "temporary emergency situation, in which Federal assistance is appropriate."

Representative Ralph W. Gwinn, Republican wheelhorse on the House Committee on Education and Labor (which will handle the proposal) stated that the funds asked by the President will serve as a "foot-in-the-door" for the advocates of Federal aid to schools.

If the proposed $1.3 billion were distributed among America's 52,000 school districts, Gwinn told HUMAN EVENTS, "it would purchase them, on the average, less than one-sixth of a classroom a year — about five seats apiece. Of course, the proponents of Federal aid know that doesn't represent much more than ten per cent of the school construction going on now in the United States — a mere bagatelle. The proponents are not interested in that. They want the first proposal to succeed, because it will be a foot-in-the-door achievement. Next year, and the next, and the next, forever, they will be after Federal aid for every conceivable purpose."

(The Eisenhower proposal would appropriate $325 million per year — $1.3 billion over four years — to meet the "emergency" in school construction needs. Since the national average cost of building a "classroom" is $38,000 — as quoted to HUMAN EVENTS by the U.S. Office of Education — this money would purchase an additional 8,550 classrooms per year. Yet classrooms are already being built at the rate of 60,000 per year.)

Others on Capitol Hill share Gwinn's belief that the proposal represents more than a "temporary" measure. What, ask the skeptics, is the "emergency"? To counter the implication that the states are unable to keep pace with increasing enrollment, thereby causing an "emergency," opponents of the plan cite these facts:

- In 1900, the ratio between students and teachers was 36.7 to 1. In 1955 it was 26.9 to 1.
- Since 1900, public school enrollment has doubled. In the same period, expenditures for the schools have multiplied 12 times.
- In the school year 1954-55, school enrollment increased by 1.1 million, calling for construction of 36,000 additional classrooms (at 30 pupils per room). Actually, 60,000 classrooms were built. Almost identical figures appeared in the school year 1955-56.
- Finally, critics of the plan wonder if the Palace Guard claque that is booming Federal aid has read a report of one of the President's own committees — The Committee on Federal Responsibility in the Field of Education. In 1954 this committee stated:

". . . Federal aid is not necessary either for current operating expenses for public schools or for capital expenditures for new school facilities. Local communities and states are able to supply both in accordance with the will of their residents."

In their assessment of the Eisenhower plan, critics of Federal aid do not deny that problems of supplying school facilities exist, since they have always existed. They point out, however, that involvement of the Federal Government in the problem can do little good, if any, and incurs the ever-present risk of Federal control. Those problems could be handled more satisfactorily, it is maintained, by the states themselves.

With regard to the "ability" of the states to pay their own way, one staffman on Capitol Hill pointed out this interesting fact: in their attempt to comply with the "separate-but-equal" doctrine which, until 1954, allowed them to maintain segregated schools, the Southern states embarked on extensive building programs. "It is obvious," he commented, "that they can build the schools if they want to. And yet these are, by and large, the very states that are supposed to reap the benefits of Federal aid."

The key to the problem, Capital observers agree, is this: since all tax money must come from within the states themselves, there can be no question of their ability to maintain the schools. And, it is added, when they realize that "Uncle Santa Claus" is not going to do it for them, they will get on more rapidly with the job.

Ibn Saud: The King of Arabia came to Washington to exploit his nuisance value, and what he wanted was money. If the fact that Ike went to the airport to welcome him will reduce the pecuniary blackmail we pay — then that's all to the good. So, many observers in Washington view the "red carpet" affair.

Saud, by the fact that he controls so much oil vital to Western Europe, and by the fact that he harbors U.S. air bases on his territory, has big nuisance value. Recently, he took over responsibility for paying Transjordan money which the British had withdrawn from that little Arab state. Saud would like to get U.S. dollars or some deal to recoup for this expense. That Saud, unlike some

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Arab rulers, is strongly anti-Soviet stands in his favor here.

However, even a number of realists here who think it's well to pay for the nuisance value wonder if our policy in the Middle East has been logically thought out. It was an error in the first place — they say — to allow Israel to be set up as a state and it inflicted a grievous wrong on the Arabs. However, Israel does exist as a state now and, as a matter of fact, swings much more military power than do the Arab states. The miserable showing made by Egypt in its brief war with Israel last fall is not forgotten.

Also, it is significant that the White House "liberals" are now taking the view that "Asiatics" are worth more to us than Westerners and some say so very bluntly. Jewish groups who wanted to see the President waited eight weeks for a date and then were given 15 minutes by Dulles. And Eden, resting in Jamaica, vainly (through diplomatic channels) sought a chance to come up and see the President.

That, say observers, may or may not be good policy. But whatever it may be, they add, why not at least make it consistent and logical? The "liberals" who insist on "Asiatics First," welcome the pro-Soviet Sukarno and pro-Soviet Nehru. But they object violently to inviting "Asiatics" Syngman Rhee of Korea and Chiang Kai-shek of Free China to our shores. Actually, a visit by the Generalissimo to the U.S. is long overdue, and it is known that he would like to come. The "liberals," it is thought, oppose it because Chiang's arrival would probably signal a great popular demonstration in his favor.

In other words, the "Asiatics First" note sounded by "liberals" in the State Department would impress more people here if it were logically and consistently followed.

Dewey Ex Machina: A great deal of what goes on in internal GOP politics is traced to Dewey's putative plans for running again in 1960. In the Senate Republican cloakrooms, most moves in this internal conflict are read in this context. It is believed that Dewey hopes to win the nomination at the 1960 convention and that some careful strategy is planned to that end well in advance.

Former GOP Chairman Len Hall is regarded as definitely Dewey's man and in line for help from Dewey in his reported bid for the New York Governorship in 1958. Hall has a good chance to win that honor — as politicos see it. If he does, he will be able to swing the New York GOP delegation behind Dewey for the nomination in the '60 convention.

It is assumed that Dewey will continue to give the impression that he supports Nixon, but that he will encourage rivals and antagonists of the Vice President. Thus, it is believed that Stassen's somewhat absurd outburst against Nixon last week end derived some encouragement from friends of Dewey. At the same time, gossip mentioning General Alfred Gruenther in connection with 1960 can scarcely be explained in any other way than as a Dewey-inspired maneuver.

Gruenther's name has been tossed around much recently, for both Secretary of State and Presidential nominee. A bit thoughtlessly, too. Certainly, the fact that he is a Roman Catholic puts a question mark behind his name so far as the Presidential nomination is concerned. Projection of the General's name in the picture is considered to be a maneuver to worry Nixon and his friends and to make the Vice President more "liberal," and therefore a captive of the left wing of the party. The calculation of the Deweyites — it is said — is that as Nixon moves further to the left, he will alienate his conservative supporters. Thus, as he approaches the convention year, his position will be progressively weakened. That outcome would improve Dewey's chances to claim the nomination for the third time.

Not Wanted: The dispute over whether or not Yugoslavia's Tito should visit the United States crystallized last week into a showdown between the Executive and the Legislature. Vigorous opposition to the scheme to bring Tito here, fusing with widespread sentiment against the Middle Eastern "Doctrine" (mail to Senators runs eight to one against it), suggests that the "honeymoon" between President and Congress is nearing a close.

For a fortnight, Congressmen scathed the Yugoslav President from the floor of the House, as anti-Tito sentiment built steadily. A petition opposing the visit co-sponsored by Majority Leader John McCormack (D.-Mass.) gathered 160 signatures in two days.

The vehemence of this Congressional opposition, it is said, had the striped pants set close to tears. The planners at Foggy Bottom, singed by the flames from Capitol Hill, had reportedly tried to arrange a quick Tito visit during Easter, when Congress would be out of session. This scheme met with little favor in Yugoslavia. Under those conditions, said Tito's Communist newspaper, *Borba*, the visit "would lose its purpose for us Yugoslavs." Tito wants full-scale VIP treatment in order to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

build his prestige at home. So, say reports from Europe, the visit is off — at least for the time being. However, the State Department bureaucrats continue to intrigue and a later decision in favor of the visit cannot be excluded.

In the Capital the affair is scored as a setback for the bureaucracy, a victory for the Legislature — and for American "public opinion" that refuses to coddle Communists. A victory, that is, "so far."

Democratic Appointees: Conservative members of Congress, inured to seeing top Government jobs handed out to admitted or pseudo-Fair Dealers, nevertheless are grumbling over the designation of Assistant Secretary of Defense Gordon Gray, who was Secretary of the Army under President Truman, to be Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization when incumbent Arthur S. Flemming bows out.

"If we should get into war, that New Dealer would be czar of our entire civilian economy," comments a long-time Republican legislator.

He also points out that the only vocal objection to confirmation of San Francisco's Fair Dealing "do gooder," James D. Zellerbach, as Ambassador to Italy came from Senator Joseph R. McCarthy.

Charles Edmundson, the U.S. Information Agency officer in Korea whose resignation was called for this week as a result of his blast against Eisenhower Administration foreign policies, was a holdover whose Fair Deal tendencies should have been apparent long since. A onetime editorial writer for the ultra-"liberal" *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, he entered Government service in 1949 under the Truman-Acheson Administration.

The real target of the House subcommittee report criticizing Republican administration of foreign aid in Iran was a veteran New Dealer who was put in that country by the Democrats and kept there by Republican administrator Harold Stassen. He is William E. Warne, a former Washington newsman who joined the Interior Department's publicity staff in 1935, rose to Assistant Secretary, and in 1951 became U.S. aid chieftain in Iran. He now is director of the U.S. aid mission in Korea.

The legislator who notes these developments believes that the Administration now is reaping the discredit that might be expected for keeping "liberals" in key posts.

Educational TV: From the Fund for the Advancement of Education, one of the myriad offshoots of the Ford Foundation, comes a report recommending that closed-circuit television be installed in every school building in the country.

The report was prepared for the Fund by Dr. Alexander J. Stoddard, former superintendent of schools in Philadelphia, Los Angeles and other cities. It makes the seemingly fantastic claim that such TV installations could save more than 100,000 teaching positions and more than $500,000,000 in annual teachers' salaries.

Such installations have been a goal of "progressive educationists," as typified by the National Education Association, since about the time telecasting became a reality. Dr. Stoddard was for ten years chairman of the NEA's Educational Policies Commission.

Two Best Sellers: *The Lattimore Story* by John T. Flynn (Devin-Adair; $1) is a continuing best seller, indicating the intense public interest in the "sellout of China."

A second book that continues to sell at the rate of about 100 a week — a real sleeper — is Frank Chodorov's *The Income Tax: Root of All Evil.* With 45 state legislatures now in session, many people are sending a copy of Chodorov's readable volume to each member of their legislatures. This book can be bought for $2 for a single copy and $1.50 in quantities of five or more from the publishers, Devin-Adair, 23 E. 26th St., New York.

Letter from JOSEPH H. BALL, former U. S. Senator from Minnesota: "HUMAN EVENTS does a first-class job of reflecting the conservative viewpoint on national affairs, which coincides in most respects with the classical 'liberal' viewpoint. The great majority of our press today has swallowed without question the pseudo-'liberal' philosophy which dominates our national politics, and which unfortunately has far more in common with totalitarianism than with individual liberty. In this situation, HUMAN EVENTS and the viewpoint it espouses become a must for any serious student of national affairs and for all who value freedom."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.

Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

Bound Annual Volume with complete Index $15. Only 1955 and 1956 Volumes are available.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS
HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1957.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Volume XIV, No. 5 HUMAN EVENTS February 2, 1957

Article Section

WHAT BUSINESSMEN CAN DO
To Combat the Foes of Business

By LEMUEL R. BOULWARE

Vice President in Charge of Public and Employee Relations for the General Electric Company

IT IS DISTURBING to observe, in the current political picture, events and trends that impair the ability of our economic system to operate in the long-range best interests of everyone. Many things that are happening may restrict the ability of businessmen to make possible an ever-rising standard of living for the American people. And curiously, businessmen themselves are to blame for much that is going wrong.

What seems most fundamentally wrong in the political scene may be summed up like this: *It's good politics to be anti-business.* Or, as one observer facetiously put it, "baiting business bags ballots."

It might seem logical, perhaps, to expect general agreement among the beneficiaries of the free enterprise system that a business is an estimable institution. Business is the principal source of the incomparably high standard of living we Americans enjoy, and a modest instrument in the attainment of a rewarding spiritual life. A housewife freed by a machine from the drudgery of hand-washing of dishes or laundry can reach out for more humanly constructive things to do for others and for greater spiritual satisfactions from her own life.

People know this, after a fashion. They know, too, that it is they — the customers of a business — who determine whether that business shall succeed or fail. They know that if a business provides a product or service they don't want, the business will fail. Yet at the polls, they apparently vote in droves for the candidates who say the interests of business and the interests of the people are opposed. Their behavior makes it "good politics" to pillory business. How has this come about?

In the first place, there are and presumably always have been businessmen foolish enough to short-change the public. There is no evidence, however, that the proportion of crooks among businessmen is any higher than in any other group of people. In fact, as a businessman's responsibilities mount, those giving him that responsibility tend to put character and social responsibility more and more at the top of the requirements he must meet. But businessmen have let the inevitable exceptions be blown up unchallenged into an appearance of being the rule.

AS TO BIG or successful business, particularly, there's another explanation for widespread public suspicion. People feel — all other things being equal — that success begets power, and that power is too likely to be used for evil purposes. The more successfully a business manages to serve and please people, the bigger it grows and thus the more the public tends to suspect it.

Another reason why the businessman is in the doghouse is the quite logical one that a lot of smart and articulate people very profitably devote their lives to putting and keeping him there. While these anti-business people try to take the credit for the good results flowing from our free enterprise system, they seek to destroy it by creating a welfare state in which *everyone*

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would be a little man — except for Federal functionaries and themselves.

These are the outright opponents of business — collectivists or, at best, people just envious of others' usefulness and success. They are enormously effective in discrediting every success that business achieves through serving the public.

The result of these natural tendencies and external pressures on people's thinking is that politicians think that voters are convinced that what's good for business is bad for them, and vice versa. That's why politicians, who generally seek to mirror the minds of the majority of their constituents, find it so useful to assault business. The voters' orientation generally controls the votes of politicians, just as customers' likes and dislikes control the design of the products of business. This is the essence of economic or political democracy, and this is quite right. Neither our political system nor our business system can tolerate runaway disregard of public sentiment.

Yet there is something quite fundamentally wrong when, as now, the political system turns up sponsoring attacks on the business system. Business, of course, deserves a good share of the blame for creating this problem and allowing it to continue unsolved. For while business has made sure its products pleased the public, it has not taken similar pains to deserve and get general understanding, approval and support for the economic system that encourages business to serve the public so well.

A Gallup poll conducted about a year and a half ago gave simple proof of the voter's lack of confidence in businessmen. The pollsters asked people which of three types of men they would most like to see as the next President of the U.S. — a man who usually sides with business, who usually sides with labor, or who usually follows a middle-of-the-road policy. The middle-of-the-roader came out well ahead, but the man who usually sides with labor polled more than three times as many votes as the man who usually sides with business.

NOW, ANY POLITICIAN who studied these statistics might well conclude that his welfare depended on (1) proclaiming he's a "middle-of-the-roader" while (2) favoring the "labor" viewpoint three-to-one over the business view.

In the last session of Congress, the search for issues gave birth to more than 100 Congressional investigations. Many of these were quite openly dedicated to digging up dirt about successful businessmen.

Current attacks on successful businesses are taking many forms. A graduated tax to punish business success in pleasing people is being urged. Socialized power advocates among the legislators are trying to prove that encouragement of private power production is designed to benefit "business" and is therefore wicked. Television networks have been under attack. Businessmen in Government jobs have been harassed. Aircraft manufacturers have been under fire. And so on. Business should certainly be open to proper public scrutiny at all times. But too often the obvious intent of political investigators is to cash in on, while adding to, anti-business prejudices.

The Democrats, of course, have been in charge of these investigations, because they have controlled both houses of Congress. But they have no copyright on the notion that it's good politics to assault business — or to court the foes of business in hopes of gathering votes.

The Republicans, too, think they see political value in capitalizing on the average voter's responsiveness to attacks on business. When the Republicans next control Congress they might find it equally advantageous to rake business over the coals. The GOP has sought more money for every major program to regulate business. In the last session, Republican representatives were reportedly absenting themselves from hearings when businessmen were testifying. So it's not a party proposition at all — just a matter of taking political advantage of existing public opinion.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This strategy, of course, is by no means confined to Washington. In an electrical industry strike last year, five state Governors, representing both political parties, intervened on the side of the union to do seemingly unwarranted damage to the company. One state government astonishingly labeled the strike a "lockout," even though action of this kind could hardly fail to kill off thousands of present jobs and scare off thousands of other potential jobs in that state for years to come. Yet the actions were obviously judged to be "good politics" for the moment.

All this might not be important if business and politics were wholly separate. But the businessman who says he's not involved in politics is kidding himself — dangerously. He may not be active in party politics. He may not read what's going on in his State Capital or in Washington. He may not even vote.

But whether he's politically inert or not, a businessman is in politics up to his ears. In an era in which Big Government delves deep into the lives of everyone, affecting his welfare from birth to death, no businessman can logically say that what politicians do or fail to do is strictly their affair — not his. A head-in-the-sand approach to the ill repute of business with both the public and the politicians can only endanger business and all the people business serves.

What's to be done? How can the people be shown that the function of a good business is to serve them, not to take advantage of them?

The answer to businessmen's political problems is to get politically important themselves — to convince the public and its representatives that, for the good of everyone, businessmen also must be listened to, encouraged and treated fairly.

Part one of the program is non-political. But it's an essential prerequisite for *political* effectiveness, as for operating effectiveness as well. This means businessmen must behave right, make sure no general complaints about business are justified, and make equally sure any exceptions to this are cleared up promptly and voluntarily. They must turn out good products, and advertise and price them fairly. They must pay their people right, and treat them right. They must do an ever-better job of satisfying people's proper hopes for dignity and extra human satisfactions from their work.

Business must be a good local taxpayer, asking no bargains. It must contribute generously to local charities. It must help support other community business all it can by making its purchases locally.

Businessmen must explain their business and all business to their employees and neighbors, so they know the problems and needs and challenges of business, and the great rewards for all that successful business can provide. They must help all concerned learn sound economics and acquire needed political sophistication.

They *must train management and other employees to be ready spokesmen* who ably and continuously tell the *positive* story of the economic and social good that business does.

They must thus get the public to withhold judgment and refrain from any precipitate action, while the full facts on controversial issues are being secured and objectively weighed.

PHASE TWO OF MAKING business politically important demands that politicians be convinced that the considered testimony and recommendations of businessmen can and will influence the voting of the politicians' constituents. The big reason now that union officials are thought to be so important politically while businessmen are usually so impotent is that, rightly or wrongly, the politicians figure union officials can and do influence votes, while businessmen can't and don't.

Businessmen and others allied to protect the public interest can be effective in direct political action. There's no excuse for defeatism when the ingredients for political effectiveness are obvious and at hand. It

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can be made good politics to be on the side of business when an informed public is shown that business is for what the public really wants and needs.

The ingredients number only five.

1. *Good issues.* Management must develop the ability to recognize what is in the long-range best interests of everyone and what is not, and then put the issue promptly, squarely and directly before the voters.

2. *Money.* Too many politicians figure unions are now the sole source of enough money to win elections. This is foolish. If businessmen and like-minded people will alert enough people to raise money from individuals on a strictly legal, ethical basis, there'll be no trouble at all getting all that's required.

3. *Mass Communication.* Effective political action, just like any other effective merchandising, requires getting the basic sales story across to the ultimate consumer, this time the voter. The voter can no more be expected to vote for a cause he knows little or nothing about than a customer can be expected to buy an unknown product.

4. *Leg-Work Organizations.* Just as salesmen wrap up the job begun by advertising, so active local leg-work organizations are essential to finishing the work done up to a point by mass communication. As any effective precinct captain knows, success depends in the last analysis on leg-work by scores of individuals who are alert, articulate, sold on the justice of their cause, and who can do the final persuading *and get out the vote on election day.*

5. *Speaking Up.* As a part of Phase One, businessmen from big names on down must become active, competent, known and accepted in making their views known, whether in print or by word of mouth, before big or small groups, in debates on television or before city governments, or at Congressional or state government hearings. To personalize the mass communication, to inspire the precinct leg-men, and to turn back instantly any new last-minute misrepresentations, businessmen must learn how to draw on the skill and credibility they developed in Phase One (Phase Two is *too late)* to make compelling and *winning* public appearances on the particular issues — and then *make* them.

These are the things businessmen need to do to overcome their helplessness and become important in the political arena. There's nothing revolutionary in any of them. As you can see, they are borrowed direct from successful product marketing. They're just the things *the opposition has borrowed from commercial sales training and has been employing so effectively against business all along.*

THIS IS NO CHALLENGE to take over Government and run it for the special advantage of business. To the extent that businessmen or farmers, labor officials or lawyers or any other group can get the power to run the Government in their special interest, democracy has failed.

The path of progress for all Americans lies not in letting any group of citizens gain undue power. Yet this seems the trend today. The foes of business, a special interest group, are gaining steadily in power and prestige. And no American dedicated to preserving both our political and our business systems can ignore this threat to the balanced best interests of all groups and individuals in the whole public.

"The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil," said Edmund Burke, "is for good men to do nothing."

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. News section sold separately — at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

This article consists of extracts from a General Electric Management Letter.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED